In re: Kang et al.

Serial No.: 10/787,424 Filed: February 26, 2004

Page 6 of 8

REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the thorough review of the present application as indicated by the Office Action. Applicants submit that the claims as amended are patentable over the cited art for at least the reasons discussed below.

The Request for a Translation:

The Office Action requests a copy of a translation of KR 2003-001217 to Jung et al. ("Jung"). Office Action, p. 2. The requested translation is submitted herewith. Applicants request consideration of the translation by the Examiner and an indication from the Examiner that the requested translation has been considered in the next communication issued in this matter.

The Anticipation Rejections:

Claims 1-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Jung. Office Action, p. 2. In rejecting claims, the Office Action asserts, among other things, that the local plate line 87 of Jung discloses the plate electrode(s) of independent Claims 1 and 10. Office Action, p. 2. The recitations of the dependent claims appear not to be addressed in the Office Action.

As seen in Figure 5 of Jung, the local plate line 87 is deposited on a planarized surface of the insulating pattern 85a, hydrogen barrier layer pattern 83a and top electrode 81. See Jung Translation, p. 21, lines 2-3 ("the insulating layer 85 and the hydrogen barrier layer 83 are planarized to expose the top electrodes 81"). As a result, the hydrogen barrier layer pattern 83a "covers sidewalls of the ferroelectric capacitors 82 ..., thereby preventing hydrogen atoms from being injected into the ferroelectric layer patterns 79," however, it does not extend onto any of the top surfaces of the ferroelectric capacitors 82. Jung Translation, p. 21, lines 5-8. Applicants submit that the present rejections should be withdrawn at least as Jung does not disclose the local plate lines 87 extending into via holes as recited in the originally filed claims. However, to expedite issuance of the present application, Applicants have amended the claims, as discussed below, to further distinguish over Jung.

In re: Kang et al.

Serial No.: 10/787,424 Filed: February 26, 2004

Page 7 of 8

In contrast to Jung, Claim 1, as amended to incorporate recitations from originally filed Claims 7 and 8, recites that the "hydrogen barrier layer pattern ... [extends] along sidewalls of the ferroelectric capacitors and an edge portion of the top surfaces of the ferroelectric capacitors." (Emphasis added). Independent Claim 10 includes corresponding recitations. As described in the present application, the interlayer dielectric layer 84 may be planarized, but the planarizing or etching is done so as to leave a desired thickness remaining in layer 84 so as to form via holes 85 with a desired aspect ratio. Specification, p. 12, lines 16-20. In addition, the present specification discusses problems that may be encountered with a planarization approach such as described in Jung. As stated in the present application:

an exposure ratio of the top electrode 78 may be non-uniform, depending on a polishing uniformity of each wafer region. Furthermore, the hydrogen barrier layer 82 on sidewalls of the ferroelectric pattern 76 may be removed, which may degrade the characteristics of the a ferroelectric capacitor characteristic and reduce uniformity between capacitors.

Specification, p. 13, lines 6-10. As such, Jung does not disclose or suggest at least these recitations of independent Claims 1 and 10. Accordingly, independent Claims 1 and 10 are patentable over Lee for at least these reasons.

The rejected dependent claims are allowable at least based on their dependence from independent Claim 1 of independent Claim 10. In light of the failure of the Office Action to address any of the recitations of the dependent claims, Applicants will not further discuss separate patentability of these claims. However, Applicants note that the present rejections are deficient in that they fail to even address the recitations of the dependent claims. Accordingly, these rejections clearly fail to state a *prima facia* case of anticipation of any of the dependent claims.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that, for the reasons discussed above, the references cited in the present rejections do not disclose or suggest the present invention as claimed.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request allowance of all the pending claims and passing this application to issue.

In re: Kang et al.

Serial No.: 10/787,424 Filed: February 26, 2004

Page 8 of 8

Respectfylly sybmitte

Robert W. Glatz

Registration No. 36,81

Myers Bigel Sibley & Sajovec, P.A.

P. O. Box 37428

Raleigh, North Carolina 27627 Telephone: (919) 854-1400 Facsimile: (919) 854-1401

Customer No. 20792

Certificate of Mailing under 37 CFR 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22 13-1450 on December 21, 2005.

Carey Gregory

476483